

Amusements and Meetings, Co-Night.

BOOTH'S THEATRE.—“King Lear.”
FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE.—“School for Scandal.”
GRAND OPERA HOUSE.—“King Richard II.”
LYCEUM THEATRE.—“The Two Gentlemen of Verona.”
GRAND GARDEN.—“Babes.”
OLYMPIC THEATRE.—Variety.
ST. FRANCIS THEATRE.—Variety.
TONY PASTOR'S NEW THEATRE.—Variety.
THIRTY-THIRD STREET OPERA HOUSE.—Kelly & Leon's.
THEATRE.—Variety.
UNION SQUARE THEATRE.—“Miss Maudlin.”
WALLACE'S THEATRE.—“The Shadworth.”

CHICKERING HALL.—Lecture. James T. Fields.
GOMER'S GARDEN.—2 and 3: Barium's Entertainment.
HILLER'S THEATRE.—Magical and Musical Performance.
HOME FOR OLD MEN.—2: Reception.
MASONIC TEMPLE.—Cromwell's Illustrated Illustrations.
NEW-YORK AQUARIUM.—Day and Evening.
STINWAY HALL.—Lecture. J. W. Forney.

Index to Advertisements.

AMUSEMENTS.—9th Page—5th and 6th columns.
BANKING HOUSES AND BANKERS.—9th Page—1st column.
BILLIARDS.—9th Page—5th column.
BOATS AND BOATMEN.—9th Page—3d column.
BUSINESS CHANCES.—9th Page—1st column.
BUSINESS NOTICES.—9th Page—1st column.
CORPORATION NOTICES.—9th Page—1st column.
DANCING ACADEMIES.—9th Page—1st column.
DEPARTMENT NOTICES.—9th Page—2d column.
DIVIDEND NOTICES.—9th Page—1st column.
FINANCIAL.—9th Page—6th column.
FIRE.—9th Page—6th column.
FURNITURE.—9th Page—2d column.
HORSES, CARRIAGES, &c.—9th Page—5th column.
HOTELS.—9th Page—4th column.
ICE CREAM.—9th Page—1st column.
INSTRUCTIONS.—9th Page—4th and 5th columns.
LECTURES AND LECTURERS.—9th Page—6th column.
MARBLE AND SLATE MERCHANTS.—9th Page—2d column.
MARRIAGES AND DEATHS.—9th Page—6th column.
MILLINERY.—9th Page—2d column.
MISCELLANEOUS.—9th Page—2d column; 10th Page—4th, 5th and 6th columns.
MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.—9th Page—3d and 4th columns.
NEW PUBLICATIONS.—9th Page—3d column.
PROPOSALS.—9th Page—6th column.
REAL ESTATE FOR SALE.—9th Page—2d column; 10th Page—2d column.
RENTS.—9th Page—2d column; 10th Page—2d column.
SALES BY AUCTION.—9th Page—3d column.
SPECIAL NOTICES.—9th Page—6th column.
SITUATIONS WANTED—MALES.—9th Page—4th column; 10th Page—4th column.
SITUATIONS WANTED—FEMALES.—9th Page—4th column; 10th Page—4th column.
STEAMBOATS AND RAILROADS.—9th Page—5th and 6th columns.
STEAMERS, OCEAN.—9th Page—2d column.
TRAVELERS.—9th Page—5th column.
WATER-CITY PROPERTY.—9th Page—2d column; BROOKLYN—9th Page—2d column; COUNTRY—9th Page—2d column.
LYN—9th Page—2d column; COUNTRY—9th Page—2d column.

Business Notices.

GENTS' TOILET SLIPPERS, and all kinds of boots and shoes for holiday presents. 3 Union-square.

DAILY TRIBUNE. Mail Subscribers, \$10 per annum.
SEMI-WEEKLY TRIBUNE. Mail Subscribers, \$5 per annum.
WEEKLY TRIBUNE. Mail Subscribers, \$2 per annum.
 Terms, cash in advance.

Persons unable to obtain THE TRIBUNE in any of the forms, boots, or hotels in which it is usually sold, will confer a favor by informing this office of the circumstances.

Up-town advertisers can leave their orders for THE TRIBUNE at 125 Broadway, cor. 3rd-st., or 308 W. 3rd-st., cor. 5th-st.

New-York Daily Tribune.

FOUNDED BY HORACE GREELEY.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1876.

WITH SUPPLEMENT.

THE NEWS THIS MORNING.

FOREIGN.—The Grand Duke Nicholas has arrived at Kischineff to take command of the Russian army.
 —The Chinese embassy are on their way to Europe.
 —It is expected in France that M. Duclerc will be called upon to form a ministry.
 —Domestic.—Florida has been declared by Hayes by 930 majority; the Democratic House in South Carolina has secured by a legal quorum of 63.
 —The electoral colleges met yesterday; there was no break in any delegation; the Tilden candidates for electors in Oregon, Louisiana, and South Carolina met and voted also; Republican electors in South Carolina and Louisiana stated that they had been offered \$10,000 and \$100,000 for their votes.
 —Gen. Garfield returned from Louisiana satisfied that the electoral vote of the State was Republican.
 —Mr. Hewitt again called on the President.
 —The remains of Baron De Palm were cremated at Washington, Penn.
 —An impeachment of the President is talked of by Democratic members of Congress.
 —CONGRESS.—The President sent a message to both Houses containing a letter from Senator Sherman and others on the election in Louisiana. A debate ensued in the Senate. The standing and select committees were announced.
 —The House listened to the reading of the message and then tabled it.
 —CITY AND SUBURBAN.—By the burning of the Brooklyn Theater over 300 lives were lost. The work of exhuming bodies from the ruins and identifying them is not yet completed. Most of the lost were young men of the humble classes, perished. The calamity caused the most intense excitement in this city and Brooklyn.
 —Gold, 108½, 108¾, 108½. Gold value of the legal-tender dollar at the close, 92½ cents. Stocks firm at the opening, but closing lower and weak.
 —THE WEATHER.—THE TRIBUNE'S local observations indicate cloudy and slightly warmer weather. In this city yesterday it was clear and cool. Thermometer, 29°, 49°, 33°.

The Democratic majority in the House has been put in charge of a committee of seven, for fear of accidents. This is well, but the size of the committee ought to be a little better proportioned to the size of the job.

In Japan the Government has given proof of its vitality by quelling in twelve days the insurrection in the southern and western provinces. The victory is tarnished, however, by the sentence of eight of the leaders to death.

Mr. Fernando Wood made some feeling remarks in Congress yesterday about his heart, and the indignation that swelled within it. Mr. Wood has all the tender susceptibility of a graven image, and when his heart swells it is a serious matter.

Gov. Kellogg seems to have been in an unnecessary hurry yesterday about the Tilden electors. If those gentlemen chose to meet and go through the form of casting their ballots, it was a ceremony that did not disturb the public peace in the least. The halls of State Legislatures are so often given up to meetings of all kinds that the spectacle of eight gentlemen meeting in a large hall and voting for Tilden could hardly have suggested anything more revolutionary than cold feet.

The locomotive is holding its ground in China. After much wrangling, the Chinese authorities have consented to allow the experimental railroad built near Shanghai to remain in British hands for a year, after which it is to be purchased by the Nanking Government. This step toward the introduction of railroads in China concerns us, since by the Burlingame treaty we have stipulated to designate engineers whenever His Imperial Majesty determines to carry out internal improvements.

In behalf of the United States Supreme Court, we respectfully protest. Senator Sherman says, in speaking of the personal composition of the Louisiana Returning Board, that its decisions are worthy of as much respect as those of our highest tribunal. We venture to suggest that, on the whole, the record of the Supreme Court is considerably better than that

of the Returning Board, and that whatever view may be taken of the action of the latter now, the Supreme Court ought not to be bandied about in cheap comparisons with Returning Boards or other political bodies whose garments are not free from the smell of fire.

Uncertainty still reigns at Versailles. President MacMahon judiciously refrains from interference, and appears as willing to accept new ministers as he is to retain those who are temporarily in power. M. Duclerc, who is expected to form a new ministry, ought to command the confidence of both radicals and conservatives. Sprung from the ranks of the people, he attained distinction as a journalist, and was Minister of Finance under the Provisional Government in 1848. He was a member of the late National Assembly, and there voted with the advanced Republicans. His career gives assurance that he will never betray the popular cause.

The suggestion made in a letter to the editor this morning, based upon a recent statute touching the choice of electors, deserves attention. If, according to this theory, the power resides in the State Legislatures to provide for casting the vote of a State in the event of the votes having been for any cause thrown out by Congress, it puts a new phase upon the whole matter, and possibly checkmates any action by the Democrats in Congress. All the disputed States are in Republican hands, and to leave the choice of electors to the Legislatures, by throwing out the present vote, would not alter the situation. The only Democratic hope in that case would be in the establishment of the Hampton Government in South Carolina and the rejection of the electoral vote of that State. The communication raises an interesting question.

The report of Senator Sherman and his colleagues in the Republican delegation to New-Orleans, which the President transmitted to Congress yesterday, gives a careful and interesting resumé of the whole Louisiana controversy, from the Republican point of view. It begins its review with the riots and persecutions of 1868, during which year it is said 2,000 cases of murder, outrage, and violence were recorded. It was the necessity of having some revision of the returns of an election vitiated by such influences that led to the establishment of the Returning Board, both parties concurring in the measure. The report gives some personal account of the present members of the Board, and adds the detailed statements of violence and intimidation in the election just past, and their results, with which Northern readers are already familiar. It is an able statement of the Republican side of this unhappy controversy, and as such it will make useful reading for the Democratic House and Democrats everywhere. Mr. Fernando Wood to the contrary notwithstanding.

The monotonous form of casting the electoral votes is this year invested with an unprecedented interest, and, unhappily, apparently darkened with the shadow of attempted bribery. While no news has been received of the meetings of a number of the more remote Electoral Colleges, it is evident that Gov. Hayes has received 185 votes, including those of Louisiana, South Carolina, and Florida, and Gov. Tilden 184. In Louisiana both sets of electors met and voted, and in South Carolina the Tilden electors met, but there is so far no announcement of their having voted. In Oregon there is a tangle of an amusing kind. One Democratic elector having been counted on in the ground of the illegibility of the Republican postmaster, the Republicans refused to act with him, and he began, in his solitary grandeur, to “fill vacancies.” The dispatches do not state whether the Republicans joined in the ballot in which Tilden received one vote, or whether the Democratic elector, in the goodness of his heart, filled the vacancies with Republicans. The one fact of importance is that a Tilden elector has the Governor's certificate. It is not likely, however, to be of much service to him. In Vermont there was a Democratic lunatic loose. He wanted Mr. Sallace's place, filed his protest, voted for Tilden, signed his own certificate, appointed himself his own messenger to Washington, and is probably already on his way, with the charitable design of making it hot for Congress. This episode has none of the serious character of the Democratic maneuver in Oregon. That attempt to defeat the clearly expressed will of the people by a party which loudly demands that that will be allowed expression elsewhere, lays bare its grasping and unscrupulous insincerity. But even this is of minor importance compared with the definite statements made of attempted bribery of electors. They come from States where Gov. Tilden's friends have been trying to secure votes, and are entitled to serious attention. There are facts within the knowledge of the proper authorities which leave little room to doubt that deliberate efforts of this kind have been made, that they were instigated from New-York, and that the money to carry them out was provided in this city. The acceptance of such a bribe would be an appalling crime; what shall we say of the offer of it?

THE BROOKLYN CALAMITY.

The first report of the burning of the Brooklyn Theater, though apparently authentic and substantially adopted by all the morning newspapers, was found, long before noon yesterday, to have been a miserably insufficient one. Instead of a loss of life, if any, as inconsiderable as such a loss can ever be, a horrified public was soon informed that the fatality had been of enormous proportions. All day long additions were made to the dreary aggregate of the dead. At 11 o'clock a. m. sixty-five bodies had been removed from the ruins, and as the operations went on the public stood aghast at the almost incredible mortality. In the afternoon the number of corpses exhumed had reached 150; before midnight it summed up 300. This number comprises the majority of all who were in the third tier. In their endeavor to escape from the gallery by the narrow stairway they overcrowded it so that it broke down, and they fell in a mass on the floor beneath. That in its turn gave way, and they were precipitated into the cellar. All the corpses are burned past recognition. The awful story is recounted in our columns, and we have only to point out here some of its salient and most startling features.

It is time, in considering such events as this, to dismiss finally all hopes of safety or of rescue which are based upon the public presence of mind. By many a severe lesson we have been taught that when fire is discovered in a well-filled theater, it is idle to anticipate any exercise of reason or reflection. Panic and prudence are simply incompatible. The instincts of self-preservation are not to be restrained, even when some control of them might result in an escape from death. The

men and women who are fleeing from destruction will crowd, jostle, shoulder, and trample each other down, unless the path is broad and fully open to all. In Brooklyn, considering the crowd and the exigency, there was a very insufficient way from the family circle; but even this difficulty would have been overcome to a great extent if the flooring in the lobby had not gone down and if the lobby doors had been sufficiently wide and had opened directly into the street. It was the dreadful crush which caused all the mischief, and those who were burned and those who were trampled down alike owed their fate to the wretched management which rendered it impossible at once to empty the house. Everything seems to have been done which could be done by the police and the professional people attached to the establishment who preserved their equanimity; but the simple fact that the terror-stricken crowd knew that the only escape from death was through the comparatively narrow doors was sufficient to frustrate the purpose of the most energetic appeals. The actress, Miss Claxton, who cried to the people, “Be quiet; we are here—between you and the fire; the front doors are ‘open and the passages are clear,’ showed a noble courage, and one is specially gratified to learn that she herself escaped. She probably owed this to the very coolness which rendered her unheeded remonstrance possible.

This may be no moment perhaps for bits of moly reflection. Still we may say that there is something peculiarly melancholy, in the deepest sense of the word, in a catastrophe like this. Sudden death is always startling and impressive even when it is individual; but the sudden death of masses of men, women, and children, gathered together for amusement, and at the moment of general enjoyment, is full of acute contrast as well as of tragic suggestion. Here, too, the agony of the bereaved was aggravated and intensified by suspense. It was so long before imploring inquirers could know the worst. The search, which must have seemed so slow, as it revealed the charred and disfigured remains of the victims, was almost a cruel kindness to those who awaited its ghastly revelations. But mixed with our feeling of natural sympathy is a mortifying sense not merely of the insecurity of human life but of the clumsiness and carelessness with which we guard it from premature extinction. Theaters can undoubtedly be built of a construction so cautious and so ingeniously arranged that such destruction as we are now considering will be simply impossible. It is frightful to think that for years we have all been frequenting theaters in which, night after night, the same tragedy deeper than any presented upon the stage, has been not only possible but probable. And yet it seems almost superfluous to say that a theater may be constructed which shall be absolutely fire-proof. The scenery itself, the most inflammable of the stage appointments, might be painted upon iron. An iron curtain might always be ready in cases of emergency to fall between the stage and the auditorium. The facilities for egress, now often and culpably narrow, might be so complete as to make it possible to empty the house in a very short period of time. Everything about the building should be amply spacious, and especially should the stairways be wide, of easy descent, and without angles.

Of the rules to be observed in the interior economy of the theater, of the need of an ample supply of water ready to be turned on at a moment's notice, of scrupulous carefulness in the illumination of all parts of the building, it seems scarcely necessary for us to say anything. If capitalists who put a great deal of money into theatrical structures, if lesses who have their all invested in the properties there, and if actors whose lives are always endangered by a conflagration of the theater, cannot together devise and build and manage a play-house which cannot be burned and which will not be a murderous trap for its patrons—if self-interest and self-preservation are insufficient to prevent these disasters, the wise will have a better reason for refusing to visit the theater at all than has yet been furnished us by ultra moralists. The danger has been established by too many examples to be despised even by the fool-hardy. Every reader of theatrical history knows how many theaters have been burned, and why they have been burned, and why insurance companies regard them properly enough as extra-hazardous risks. To say that there is no help for this is to underrate human ingenuity.

The lesson of the Brooklyn tragedy is such a simple one that it will be strange if those who have the control of theaters do not profit by it, for their own sake, if not for the sake of the public by which they live and get great gain. We have no reason, unfortunately, for perfect confidence that the present warning will not be wasted upon reckless managers and a still more reckless public. For about what we call accidents we are singularly obtuse. Ships and railway trains are wrecked for want of the simplest precautions, and with enormous loss of life; garrulous discussion ensues, and after a little interval ships and railway trains are wrecked with even greater loss of life again. A considerable advance toward absolute safety from fatal “accidents” we undoubtedly have made; but we shall not think that society has done enough or learned wisely and sufficiently until such a fire as that in Brooklyn on Tuesday night has become much more nearly impossible.

FIRES IN THEATERS.

Many suggestions will be called forth by the calamity in Brooklyn. Perfect safety for large audiences may be impossible of attainment, but there are a few measures that can be adopted immediately, and ought to be made compulsory. The means of exit from upper galleries should be made fully as ample as those from the lower portions of the auditorium, since the occupants of those galleries will have further to go in escaping. Narrowing a passage-way in any one part is as dangerous as narrowing the whole of it; neglect on this point was the chief cause of the heaviest loss of life in the Brooklyn Theater. Several of our theaters are quite as dangerously contrived in that particular, and need prompt attention from the authorities. If ever inventors should be successful in constructing a practical fire-escape that could be of service to a crowd of people as well as to a few, it should be attached to theater windows, and would be more important there than on tenement-houses. A few of our theaters have only narrow and dangerous means of exit from every part of the house. Our Fire Marshals are perfectly conversant with these facts. Such buildings should be altered without delay. In the present temper of the public, no excuse will be accepted, and it will not answer for officials to shift the responsibility for neglect from one department to another and leave the buildings in their present condition.

Where there are extra doors for exit, they

should be thrown open every night when the audience is withdrawing. Otherwise such doors are apt to be fastened when the great emergency arises for their use. It is in evidence that the extra doors in the Brooklyn Theater were bolted and the bolts rusted. By a mere piece of fortune, one of the employes happened to have an iron bar in his pocket, with which he forced the bolts; otherwise the loss of life would have been still larger. It is not quite sufficient simply to provide such doors, even with the addition of a sign attached to them, as in the Brooklyn Academy of Music, stating that they can be opened in case of alarm.

Ample means should be provided for extinguishing a fire in a theater; but these alone are not enough; the employes should be trained and practiced as the men are on some steamships, so that upon an alarm of fire each is ready to perform his special duty, and there is no confusion or wasted effort. The showy scenes of modern stage-carpentry have introduced new perils. Scenery which includes a canvas roof or other extensive flat or sloping parts is specially dangerous. Had there been none but upright scenes on the stage in Brooklyn when the burning portion of the fly was cut off and fell, doubtless the fire could have been easily extinguished then and there. But an iron screen that could be let down as a stage curtain would probably prove more effective in saving life when scenery takes fire than any other means of precaution.

EX-GOV. SEYMOUR ON CORRUPTION.

We cheerfully concede the honesty and sincerity of the Hon. Horatio Seymour when he says, as he did in his address to the Electoral College at Albany on Tuesday, “I know that ‘I seek only to save the honor of our common country and to secure the welfare of the American people without regard to party distinctions.’” But we recognize also the candor of the declaration with which he prefaces the statement, “My faith in the party to which I am attached and my indebtedness to its members may cloud my judgment.” With great respect for Gov. Seymour's high character and perfect faith in his personal integrity and the honesty of his intentions, we must still say not only that there is a possibility that partisanship may cloud his judgment, but that to an impartial mind familiar with the facts the conclusion is unavoidable that his judgment has been so clouded, notwithstanding the purity of his motives and his manifest anxiety to free himself from prejudice. Gov. Seymour's speech, of which the sentences we have quoted are the conclusion, is a vigorous, and, for him, harsh and bitter arraignment of the party now in power for attempting, as he believes, to defraud the people of the country of their choice and count in the Republican candidates by fraud. The premises being true, no exception could be taken to the vigor and force of the arraignment or to the earnestness of his denunciation of the crime. Whatever may be said of the good taste and propriety of Gov. Seymour's appearance in the role of accuser or judge, to which we shall presently refer, there certainly is no dispute as to the magnitude of the offense charged and no question as to the suitability of the terms in which he expresses his righteous indignation. Gov. Seymour's views upon this subject to-day are precisely those which THE TRIBUNE has always held, and to which it gave frequent and positive utterance as long ago as 1868, upon an occasion which the Governor may possibly remember.

One reason why we think he has allowed his judgment to be clouded by partisanship is the obvious haste with which he has jumped to the conclusion that corruption on the large scale he intimates has been practiced, and that fraud on a much larger was intended. It was not Gov. Seymour's habit to fall in so readily with current rumor and credit charges of fraud upon State officials and others a few years ago, when, as all the world knows, there was very much more proof of them than in the present case. If our memory serves us he was quite content to wait until the proofs were indisputable before making up his judgment. And even then we do not remember any such protest or indignant denunciation of this great crime as his speech of Tuesday contained. Possibly faith in the party to which he was attached and his indebtedness to its members may have clouded his judgment then, and made his action conservative and cautious. But we think we detect another sign of clouded judgment in the stress he lays upon the fact that the Democratic candidates have a popular majority, and the inference therefrom that the declaration of the election of their opponents must be by unfair methods and is revolution. Gov. Seymour knows, of course, that the election of a President by a minority of the popular vote is quite possible under our Constitution, without any resort to unfair methods, that it has several times so happened, and that it is in thorough accordance with his own and his party's theory of the Federal system, the rights of States, and their relations to the General Government. There is no occasion certainly for any outburst of indignation here. It was a contingency contemplated by the founders of the Government, was fully discussed in all its consequences, and has so often happened that the apparent inconsistency and injustice of it have been fully discounted in the public mind. Had Gov. Seymour spoken with a little more frankness upon this subject, even as a Democratic partisan, he would have said the question is not one of a popular majority. The President is elected, not by the people, but by the States. That is Democratic doctrine.

Now as to the propriety of Gov. Seymour's appearance in this particular rôle. We repeat that we do not doubt his sincerity or the honesty of his indignant denunciation of the Louisiana Returning Board. We believe he has an honest aversion for the members of that Board; that he thinks “their touch and presence are polluting,” and that he is profoundly in earnest when he says such plots as he believes them guilty of “invoke anarchy, distress, and dishonor.” And he utters a solemn truth to which the country should give heed—a truth as cogent now as in 1868—when he says: “Aroused patriotism can crush resistance to law, but corruption kills honor, virtue, and patriotism, saps the foundations of society, and brings down the structure of States and nations in ruin and dishonor.” All forcibly and clearly stated, and as true as Gospel. And yet these things were just as true in 1868 when, by the most gigantic election frauds ever known in the history of the country, the electoral vote of New-York was given to Horatio Seymour, and John T. Hoffman was counted in and held the office of Governor. The men who perpetrated those frauds were full as bad as the Louisiana or any other Returning Board has ever been charged with being. But they were Democrats. Mr. Seymour never thought their “touch and presence polluting.” It never oc-

curred to him, so far as we know, that any such fearful consequences were likely to flow from their crimes. He never, to our knowledge, drew back his hand from Tweed or refused him recognition. And he certainly never protested against the frauds which gave him New-York's electoral vote and made John T. Hoffman Governor. It makes a mighty difference after all who commits the fraud and who profits by it. Gov. Seymour's words to-day would have had vastly more weight if, in the course of a long public career in the State of New-York, during which he must have known that his party was in the habitual practice of fraud, he had ever put in one single little word of protest against it. We think he is honest, but we agree with him that partisanship may have clouded his judgment. And we must say that under all the circumstances he would have shown better taste had he kept silent.

THE DISPUTED STATES.

Florida completes the list, the official count giving a majority of over 900 to the Republican electors. On the face of the returns the majority was less than fifty, and, correcting errors, only one majority for one of the electors, but the power of the board to scrutinize the legality of the vote at the different precincts has been exercised, and certain precincts have been officially excluded from the count. Attorney-General Cocke, who has been supposed to sympathize with the Democrats, voted in favor of this exclusion, and the action of the board was unanimous. In this case, as in South Carolina, it cannot be claimed that the decision is unjust, for, if the canvassers had acted upon the returns alone, they would have declared elected the same persons to whom they now give certificates after investigation. The result in Louisiana alone has been reached by the exclusion of returns from precincts in which, it is decided, no legal and fair election was held. The justice of that decision will be doubted by some and affirmed by others, but it is the legal decision of the only body empowered under the laws of the State to canvass the votes. Unless it be overturned by further investigation and competent authority, we are bound to accept that decision. Moreover, it cannot be set aside by the wild clamor of partisans. Abundant proof has been presented to satisfy every reasoning mind that there was no legal election in many precincts of Louisiana, but, on the contrary, a state of unrestrained violence and unspeakable brutality, and a reign of terror which rendered a free election impossible. The doubt, in the minds of candid men, is not whether such a condition existed in many localities, but whether it existed so generally, and with such effect, as to warrant the decision of the board. Evidence on that question will be accumulated for months. Meanwhile we have nothing to do but to accept, as the legal and presumably the just decision, that which the board has rendered.

Public opinion would be very much less inclined to that course but for two facts. Ever since the votes were cast the Democratic leaders and journals have shown a disposition to take advantage of any technicality, any trick, any fraud, or any act of violence whatever, in order to succeed. They have openly avowed the hope that the will of the people might be defeated in Vermont, Nebraska, and Oregon; have resorted to glaring judicial usurpation to defeat it in South Carolina; and the gathering of the armed men at Columbia showed a readiness to prevent the casting of the votes by force. These things have gone far to turn against them that just public opinion which was, at the outset, inclined rather to apprehend wrong from Republican managers. Moreover, to the end the Democrats have claimed as perfectly legal the entire vote of the parishes in which it is most notorious that no legal election was held—in East Feliciana, for example, where not a single Republican voted out of more than 2,000 registered. The natural feeling is that men who want to win by such means are not entitled to confidence when they claim to have been wronged.

But the great fact in this case is that the Republicans have not relied upon vague and loose assertions of intimidation as they did, either in neglect of public opinion or from inability to do otherwise, on former occasions, but have submitted a mass of proof which impresses very strongly those who have examined it. The most cautious witnesses who have investigated the matter at New-Orleans, with no predilection favorable to the Republicans, are staggered, and some, including Mr. Redfield of *The Cincinnati Commercial*, completely convinced, by this array of testimony. Now the question is one of fact, and a peculiarly difficult one to decide. Prof. Lowell, whose fairness and independence have lately been acknowledged by his opponents, has very justly remarked that this question did not seem to be one which could be answered a thousand miles away. If those who have investigated it most thoroughly on the spot find the Republican case exceedingly strong, there is, at least, all the presumption in its favor which an official decision gives. That decision may be reversed, or the full evidence may show that it was incorrect, but the only legitimate and proper presumption at this time is that it was based upon evidence which few persons have yet had opportunity to examine.

We should greatly rejoice to know that Messrs. Hayes and Wheeler had been duly elected, with such strict regard for law and justice that fair men could not dispute the result. As yet we have only a less gratifying assurance that the official decision in their favor is legal and just in every State but one, and in that State, though still open to doubt, is supported by a strong presumption and by a mass of proof which unprejudiced investigators treat with great seriousness and respect.

CREMATION AND BURIAL.

The incineration of the remains of the Baron de Palm yesterday at Washington, Penn., will renew the discussion of the comparative advantages of burning and of burial. As a chemical experiment before an audience consisting largely of newspaper reporters the affair was a success. As a great social innovation, destined to change the civilized world's customs, it was not impressive although no expense had been spared with such intent. A few hours after the process was finished, the gentlemen who had had it in charge made speeches about its merits, at a meeting in the Town Hall. The event will lend special interest to that portion of the Sixth Annual Report of the Massachusetts State Board of Health which examines the relative advantages of these two methods of disposing of the dead. This part of the Report is written by Dr. J. F. A. Adams of Pittsfield, Mass. It contains a Bibliography of Cremation, which shows by its extent and variety the great interest which

the subject has excited, mostly in modern times. In conclusion, after a full and fair discussion, Dr. Adams sees no cause for changing the present system of burial. He regards it as “endured to the hearts of all Christendom by ‘ties of religion and sentiment.’” As practiced in the rural cemeteries of to-day, he does not consider it open to any reasonable objection.

Upon the point, and it is an important one, of the influence of the burial of the dead upon the public health, Dr. Adams is greatly surprised at the small amount of evidence which he has been able to gather of any positive injury known to result from burial-grounds. Only five cases have been reported in Massachusetts. One of these occurred “years ago,” one “some years ago,” two are accounted for by neighboring nuisances with which burial had nothing to do; and in only one was there a reasonable presumption that the cemetery may have caused injury to health. The weight of testimony from different parts of the country is against any appreciable injury to the public health from the proximity of cemeteries. Nor can Dr. Adams, after the most careful analysis, find a single example of disease presumably induced by water contaminated by the neighborhood of burial-grounds. The whole matter is summed up as follows: “A living man in sound health is far more to be ‘breathed as a disease-producing agent’ than ‘is a dead man buried with ordinary care.’” Of medical gentlemen interrogated upon the point, more than a third gave their testimony in favor of the adoption of cremation as a substitute for burial. But some of the opposite opinions were very strong ones. Dr. Acland of Oxford, England, regards inhumation as “the ‘best, scientifically, and the most congenial to ‘human feelings.’” Dr. Beale of London regards interment as “the only method really ‘available.’” Prof. Charles A. Cameron of Dublin is of opinion that “the earth is the ‘proper receptacle of dead bodies.’” Dr. Beard of this city thinks that “the amount ‘of sickness that is demonstrably caused by ‘cemeteries must be comparatively trifling.’” There is difference of opinion among medical men, but it does not appear to be either strong or wide.

Finally, according to Dr. Adams, pyre cremation as performed by the ancients and by modern Asiatic nations is an incomplete and disgusting process. Cremation by the Siemens furnace at a very high temperature is in no way offensive, nor is it likely to contaminate the atmosphere. Burial in contracted spaces of ground has been repeatedly proved injurious to the health of the community. Extra-mural interment, with regulations for preventing crowding, prevents any possible injury to the public health. Lastly, cremation “is an ‘innovation not demanded in this country on ‘sanitary grounds.’” These views, being those of one who has given an unusually careful attention to the subject, have a higher value at least than the sentiments of those who have only given the question cursory or poetical consideration.

PERSONAL.

The son of the late President Tyler is a professor at William and Mary College.
 President Wellings of Columbian University is not to be an editor of the new Democratic newspaper, as was reported.
 Gov. Hayes's grandfather, Roger Birchard, lived in an old cemetery, where his grave is often visited by his grandson.
 Mr. Edwin Booth has donated most honorably earned. It is pleasant to state that he has just paid \$142,500 for a block of buildings in Chicago.
 Cadet Smith, the colored boy who did not particularly enjoy life at West Point and who was dismissed for incompetency, has just died in South Carolina, where he was teaching.
 Miss Ellis, the young lady at Wellesley, who has been forced to resign her post as class poet because her brilliant brother-student did not think a woman ought to hold it, may comfort herself with the reflection that it was all a matter of prejudice and not of brains.
 Walt Whitman does not believe in cremation. He said the other day, “It makes a fellow tremble to think of an iron-hot port of progress of the age. When the life has gone out of the body I rather respect the old shell for all it has been as well as for all it has contained.”

Miss Frances Power Cobbe is a writer of good English and stout editorial; she is also a middle-aged woman of the most liberal proclivities. Complaining one day that she had a “pain in the small of her back,” a spoiled infant of a younger brother cried rather to her discomfiture, “Well, Fanny, where is the small of your back?”
 Archbishop Wood sat in his Philadelphia audience the other day. In came a reporter of *The Inquirer* and said, “Are you going to burn the body of Baron de Palm to-morrow at Washington?” Then answered the Archbishop (says the reporter): “And his body will be burning in the other world, and his soul will be burning in the other world, and his soul will be burning in the other world, and his soul will be burning in the other world.”

Gov. Jewell's younger daughter is a very charitable young person. She has \$2,500 a year for pin-money, and during her last winter in Washington spent nearly all her money in supporting several poor families, whom she daily visited in person, and for whose welfare she cared. She also organized a sewing society, whose weekly work was a number of garments for the poor. Thus writes the admiring correspondent of *The Troy Times*.

President Grant has been telling Senator Gordon this story, and is not the worst for having been told to tell it. When the three Constitution-makers met at the Convention, Mr. Stephens came swaddled up to the top of an enormous overcoat. Lincoln called me aside as Stephens was disrobing, and observed, ‘Grant, what do you think of that?’ ‘I don't know,’ I answered. ‘Mr. President, I do not know. But what do you think of it?’ ‘With one of his queer winks, Lincoln said: ‘It reminds me of the biggest snakes out of the smallest car I ever saw in my life.’”

At a certain hour every afternoon Washington loungers on suburban drives meet an old gentleman jogging along on a very trusty, sure-footed animal. It is George Bancroft. His gray hair and long floating beard run together. His large spectacles seem to be held on by the shield of the low cap he wears, and his slight, trim, little form is always closely compassed by a snug-fitting double-breasted coat. He rides with ease, and for so old a man with gray hair and a long nose, he is as vigorous as many men of half his age. His habits are regular, studious, methodical. He rises early—at about 5 o'clock in the winter—kindles his own gas-lamp, takes a cup of coffee, and works. He has taken upon him many of the habits of the student men of the old world, and performs much of his labor before the day of modern political science has begun to take its place in the evening he either receives his friends, or attends the reception of some distinguished person.

POLITICAL NOTES.

And yet the National debt might have been paid with bananas from Santo Domingo.
 The times are ripe for another manifesto from the National Democratic headquarters.
 The general sentiment about the first day's work of the Democratic House seems to be that the party is “the ‘strongest’ in the country.”
 It may be a misapprehension, but it looks as if a stranger wandering into Columbia, S. C., at this time would be in danger of being seized and seated as a member of the Republican Legislature.
 Will some eminent publicist now take his pen from behind his ear and set forth with reasonable compass the sum total of beneficent results accomplished by the pilgrimage of the visiting statesmen?
 The President's message has not stirred up any animated comment. Even the Democrats are not able to get excited about it, which is the best possible evidence of its harmless character. The Republican journals are not able to say much more about it than that it is “a thoroughly characteristic document,” which nobody can deny.
 If there is any blunder in the power of the Democratic party to commit which would be so stupid that the party press could not explain and justify it, that blunder is still to be made. The refusal to admit the Congressmen from Colorado was pretty bad, yet the ingenious press justifies it, and has the cohesiveness to accuse the Senate of dishonesty because it seated, without question, two Senators from the same State. If it was dis-